

Atty. Dkt. No. 99PS017/KE

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 23 and 24 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-26 remain pending in this application.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,243,568 (Detlef). The Examiner states:

Referring to claims 1, 10, and 19, Detlef et al. teach a wireless communication system including a plurality of intercommunicating transceivers to send and receive messages of digitally encoded information (col. 4, lines 7-10). As shown in Fig. 4, Detlef et al. teach a static signal 44 superimposed upon the communicated information 32 presented in time period 36, in response to received message 30 received during time period 34. Static signal 44 is added to communicated information 32 during the entire time period 36 (col. 7, lines 39-45). Detlef et al. further teach when the signal quality estimate is greater than, or equal to, the first minimum quality level, the indicator, which is a static signal (col. 5, lines 51-55), is not activated; and when the signal quality estimate is less than the first minimum quality level, the indicator is activated, whereby the user is warned of a message quality below a specified standard (col. 5, lines 60-67). With reference to Fig.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99PS017/KE

6, Detlef et al. teach the information demodulated, or decoded, in response to received message 30 during time period 34 is not presented as communicated information 32 during time period 36. Rather, extrapolated information 48 is presented as communicated information during time period 36. During time period 36, received message 30 is properly recovered (col. 9, lines 23-27).

In regard to claim 2, as cited above, Detlef et al. teach the received messages are digitally encoded information, thus are discrete values.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants reserve the right to swear behind Detlef if necessary.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 3-5, 8-9, 13-15, 18, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Detlef. The Examiner states:

Referring to claims 3-4, 13-15, 20-22, although Detlef et al. do not use the electronic system comprising a commercial airline display unit comprising an LCD display unit, or a commercial airline tapping unit, Detlef et al. do teach the communication system is a digital television signal broadcast to digital televisions, and the signal quality estimated in step a) is also responsive to the detection of the loss of sequential broadcast frames. The warning indicator in step b) is a snow-like visual degradation, whereby the user sees an intuitive warning that the received message quality is poor (col. 3, lines 66-67, and col. 4, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the electronic system in a commercial airline display unit comprising an LCD display unit in order to provide entertainment to airplane passengers.

Referring to claims 5 and 18, with reference again to Fig. 4, Detlef et al. teach the indicator signal is a logic signal. As specified in the specification of the application (page 16), a nominal 28-volts signal indicates a logical value of "1" of "on" indication, it

Atty. Dkt. No. 99PS017/KE

would have been a matter of design choice to use a 28-volts amplification circuit to indicate the logical value for "1" or "on", since Applicant has not disclosed that a 28-volts amplification circuit solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that any logical voltage level including a 28-volts on indication would function equally well.

In regard to claims 8 and 9, as cited above, since the signal received are in digital encoded and modulated format (col. 6, lines 38-40), the logic value of the received signals should be unaltered. In addition, 5 volt deviation is the standard deviation for signals, it would have been a matter of design choice to use 5 volt deviation since Applicant has not disclosed that a 5 volt deviation solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that other deviation voltage would function equally well.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to recite:

the static signal being a status signal indicating an operational condition, the static signal being a fixed first voltage level to indicate a first status and a second fixed voltage level to indicate a second status. . . .

Using such a static signal to provide additional information is advantageous. Such a signal allows additional information to be provided on existing lines without affecting dynamic signals, such as, video signals. This technique is a particularly useful in electronic systems and especially avionic electronic systems.

Detlef does not show, describe, or suggest the use of superimposed data on a static signal. Detlef merely describes the superimposition of static (another dynamic signal) on an existing video signal. Applicants note that although the term "static signal" is used in Detlef, it is referring to a completely different concept. The term "static" in Detlef refers to static noise or snow to a video or audio signal.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99PS017/KE

Applicants note that the Examiner's citation in Detlef for the static signal in Figure 4 shows a static signal that provides varying static provided to signal 32. This is different than providing data on a non-dynamically changing signal, a static signal as that term is used in claims 1, 10 and 19. Clearly, the video or audio signal in Detlef does not indicate an operational characteristic of the device with a fixed first value and a fixed second value. Therefore, Detlef does not show, describe, or suggest the static signal and the superimposition of data thereon as recited in claims 1, 10 and 19. In fact, Detlef teaches away from the present invention because it teaches the superimposition of more data on a dynamically changing signal. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, independent claim 2-5 and 8-9, independent claim 10 and its dependent claims 13-15 and 18, independent claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-22 are patentable over the cited art.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 6-7, 11-12, 16-17, and 23-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that claims 6-7, 11-12, 16-17, and 23-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have rewritten claims 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, and 23-24 in independent form. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6-7, claim 11 and its dependent claim 12, claims 16-17, and claims 23-24 are patentable.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 25 and 26 are allowed.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99PS017/KE

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 23, 2003

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.
400 Collins Road, NE
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

By Kyle Eppele
Kyle Eppele
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,155

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 24 2003

-15-